

REMARKS

Claims 1-43 are pending.

Claims 1-43 are rejected.

The final office action dated May 22, 2008 indicates that claims 1-2, 6-14, 21-23 and 37-39 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Puram U.S. Patent No. 6,289,340 in view of Stimac U.S. Publication No. 2003/0071852. The final office action also indicates that claims 4-5, 24-25 and 40 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Puram in view of Stimac and McGovern U.S. Patent No. 5,918,207. The rejections have been rendered moot by the amendments above.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite a method for job requisition, comprising:
providing an inline interview to one or more job seekers, wherein each job seeker is presented with a list of skills relating to a position of interest, and asked to rank their efficiency with each of the skills and also rank their desire to perform each of the skills; and
generating a score for each of the job seekers, each score based at least in part on the rankings.

Support for the ranking of a desire to perform a skill can be found on Figure 3, element 154 and page 6, lines 21+ of the application.

The ranking of a desire to perform a skill (e.g., like very much, like indifferent) can give unique insight into a job seeker. It can indicate how the job seeker perceives the job position being sought. As disclosed on page 12, lines 25+ of the application, it can improve “the understanding of job seekers (and employees) of the requirements of a given position prior to the hiring of a job seeker.”

Paragraph 28 of the final office action cites figures 44 and 57 and paragraph 141 of Stimac, and states that it discloses a single question about a desire to work in a

fast moving environment. However, figure 44 and paragraph 141 do not appear to disclose the question. Figure 57 discloses the question, but it appears to ask for a yes/no answer about a single topic. The question does not ask a job seeker to rank his or her desire to perform a list of skills. In any event, the question does not relate to job skills.

Paragraph 30 of the final office action alleges that McGovern discloses the targeting of candidates for skills that differ from those that they expressed a preference. However, McGovern does not support the allegation. McGovern appears to be silent about job seekers. McGovern also appears to be silent about preferences. See McGovern's Figure 5, which illustrates the documentation of candidate skills. It does not teach or suggest a job requisition in which preferences for a skill are ranked or scored.

Paragraph 31 of the office action alleges that information about preferences can be used to match an employee with the type of work that he or she enjoys so as to reduce turn-over, etc. However, McGovern doesn't support the allegation. McGovern doesn't appear to be concerned about finding a job that an employee enjoys. McGovern discloses a system that is supposed to anticipate and develop technical skills and capabilities within a work force, and ensure that a customer is provided with a person having the right skills at the right time (col. 2, lines 28-33).

The conclusion in paragraph 31 is also inconsistent with the allegation in paragraph 30. Paragraph 31 of the office action concludes that preferences can be used to find jobs that employees enjoy performing. In contrast, paragraph 30 alleges that an employee might be targeted for a job that he or she doesn't prefer. And neither allegation nor conclusion is supported by McGovern.

The documents made of record do not teach or suggest a job requisition that includes the ranking of desires to perform skills in a list. Nor has a clear and consistent

rationale for obviousness been presented. Therefore, claim 1 should be allowed over the documents made of record.

Claims 5, 10, 16-18 and 20 should also be allowed, as they depend from amended claim 1. New claims 44-47 should also be allowed, as they depend from amended claim 1. Claims 2-4, 9, 11-15 and 19 have been cancelled.

New claims 48-49 and dependent claims 25 and 30 should be allowed for the same reasons that amended claim 1 should be allowed. Claims 21-24, 26-29 and 31-43 have been cancelled.

If the Examiner has any questions or wishes to further discuss this application, he is encouraged to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

/Hugh Gortler #33,890/
Hugh P. Gortler
Reg. No. 33,890
(949) 454-0898

Date: August 21, 2008